

### **REMARKS**

Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between steps. Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 23 to 25 have been canceled without prejudice. Claim 14 has been amended. New claim 26 has been added.

Reconsideration of the application based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Interview Summary**

An interview was conducted between Examiner Palabrica and William Gehris on August 27, 2008, discussing a proposed amendment in claim 14 and a new claim 26. The amendment was not acceptable to Examiner Palabrica, therefore applicant has included other changes which are believed to be acceptable as per the interview, in particular, the Examiner's concern about "for at least one pair" has been addressed. This language has been removed, and design of a plurality of the claimed guide tubes has been addressed, as per the specification. In regards to new claim 26, no agreement was reached but Examiner Palabrica agreed to consider new claim 26. Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and effort.

### **35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections**

Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite in part "designing the guide tubes as a function of the maximum circumferential stress." Support is found at page 7, lines 30 to 31, page 21,

lines 23 et seq., page 14, lines 9 to 11, page 17, lines 13 to 18, page 17, line 29 to page 18 line 14, and page 20, lines 3 to 13, for example.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 14 to 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between steps.

Claim 14 has been amended to address all of the guide tubes.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 14 to 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

#### 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 14 to 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to a non-statutory subject matter.

More than a simple numerical value is now being claimed in claim 14 and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 14 to 18 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

If any additional fees are deemed to be due at this time, the Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of the same to Deposit Account No. 50-0552.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris (Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940